

RUDIN'S THEOREM AND PROJECTIVE HULLS

John Wermer

We denote by Δ the closed unit disk, by Γ the unit circle, and by $\mathfrak{A}_0$ the disk algebra, which consists of all functions holomorphic in $\text{int}(\Delta)$ and continuous on Δ .

By a *module* over $\mathfrak{A}_0$ we mean a vector space $\mathfrak{M}$ of continuous complex-valued functions on Δ such that the constant 1 lies in $\mathfrak{M}$, and for every $a_0 \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ and $\varphi \in \mathfrak{M}$, one has $a_0 \cdot \varphi \in \mathfrak{M}$.

In his book “Real and Complex Analysis” (1966) Walter Rudin proved Theorem 12.13 which gives, in particular:

THEOREM 1. *Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a module over $\mathfrak{A}_0$. Assume that the maximum principle holds for $\mathfrak{M}$ in the following sense:*

$$\forall f \in \mathfrak{M} \text{ and } \forall z_0 \in \text{int}\Delta, \quad |f(z_0)| \leq \sup_{\Gamma} |f|. \quad (1)$$

Then every function in $\mathfrak{M}$ is holomorphic.

NOTE. In 1953 Rudin had proved the corresponding statement with “module” replaced by “algebra”.

Recently, in [2], R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson introduced the notion of the *projective hull* of a compact set X in $\mathbf{C}^n$ as follows. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_d$ the space of polynomials on $\mathbf{C}^n$ of degree $\leq d$. Consider points $x \in \mathbf{C}^n$ such that there exists a constant C_x for which

$$|P(x)| \leq (C_x)^d \sup_X |P| \quad (2)$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{P}_d$ and all d . The set of such points x is denoted $\widehat{X}$ and is called the *projective hull* of X in $\mathbf{C}^n$. Note that if $C_x = 1$, then (2) implies that x lies in the polynomial hull of X . They make the following

CONJECTURE . *If γ is a real-analytic closed curve in $\mathbf{C}^n$, then $\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma$ is a 1-dimensional complex analytic subvariety of $\mathbf{C}^n - \gamma$.*

NOTE. The real analyticity of γ is important, since the analogous conjecture for a C^∞ -curve fails if the curve is not pluripolar.

In what follows we consider some questions related to Rudin's Theorem and to the projective hull of a closed curve in $\mathbf{C}^2$.

THEOREM 2. *Let φ be a continuous function on Δ such that the restriction of φ to Γ is real analytic. Let*

$$\mathfrak{M} = \{a + b\varphi : a, b \in \mathfrak{A}_0\} \subset C(\Delta). \quad (3)$$

Assume for each $x \in \text{int}\Delta$ that there exists a constant M_x such that for all $f \in \mathfrak{M}$:

$$|f(x)| \leq M_x \cdot \sup_{\Gamma} |f| \quad (4)$$

Then φ (and hence every function in $\mathfrak{M}$) is holomorphic in Δ .

NOTE. Condition (4) states that the evaluation functional: $f \mapsto f(x)$, on $\mathfrak{M}$, is a bounded linear functional in the sup-norm on Γ , for all $x \in \text{int}(\Delta)$. It implies that two functions in $\mathfrak{M}$ which coincide on Γ are equal in $\mathfrak{M}$. This allows us to give $\mathfrak{M}$ the norm: $\|f\| = \sup_{\Gamma} |f|$, making $\mathfrak{M}$ a subspace of $C(\Gamma)$.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let L be the functional $f \mapsto f(0)$ on $\mathfrak{M}$. By (4), $\|L\| \leq M_0$, so by Hahn-Banach and F. Riesz, there exists a measure σ on Γ such that

$$f(0) = \int_{\Gamma} f d\sigma \quad \forall f \in \mathfrak{M}. \quad (5)$$

We do not know that $\|\sigma\| = 1$, only that $\|\sigma\| < \infty$.

We take $f(\zeta) = \zeta^n$, $n > 0$ and get from (5) that

$$\int_{\Gamma} \zeta^n d\sigma = 0 \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \quad \text{and} \quad (6)$$

$$\int_{\Gamma} 1 d\sigma = 1 \quad (7)$$

We do not know that σ is a positive measure.

We further have that

$$\int_{\Gamma} \zeta^n \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = 0 \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \quad \text{and} \quad (8)$$

$$\int_{\Gamma} 1 \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = 1 \quad (9)$$

The last four equations give

$$\int_{\Gamma} \zeta^n \left(d\sigma - \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right) = 0 \quad n \geq 0. \quad (10)$$

By the F. and M. Riesz Theorem which identifies annihilating measures for the disk algebra, there exists $h \in H_0^1(\Gamma)$ such that

$$d\sigma - \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = h \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \quad (11)$$

Let us now fix $\varphi \in \mathfrak{M}$ and apply (5) to the functions $z^n \varphi$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ all of which belong to $\mathfrak{M}$. We get

$$\int_{\Gamma} \zeta^n \varphi d\sigma = 0 \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \quad \text{and}$$

$$\int_{\Gamma} 1\varphi d\sigma = \alpha \quad \text{for some constant } \alpha.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\Gamma} \zeta^n \left(\varphi d\sigma - \alpha \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right) = 0 \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Hence there exists $k \in H_0^1(\Gamma)$ such that

$$\varphi d\sigma - \alpha \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = k \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \quad (12)$$

Multiplying (11) by φ , we get

$$\varphi d\sigma - \varphi \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \varphi h \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}. \quad (13)$$

Now h and k are boundary functions defined on Γ of functions defined and holomorphic on $\text{int}\Delta$. (We again denote these functions on $\text{int}\Delta$ by h and k .) From (12) and (13) we get

$$(\alpha + k) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \varphi(1 + h) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad \text{as measures on } \Gamma.$$

If $1 + h = 0$ a.e. on Γ , then $\alpha + k = 0$ a.e. on Γ , so from (12) we get that $\varphi = 0$ a.e. on Γ , and so φ is identically zero, which we may exclude. An H^1 -function which is not identically zero is $\neq 0$ a.e. on Γ , and so $1 + h \neq 0$ a.e. on Γ . It follows that

$$\varphi = \frac{\alpha + k}{1 + h} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma. \quad (14)$$

Since φ is real analytic on Γ there exists an analytic continuation $\tilde{\varphi}$ of φ from Γ to an annulus: $1 - \epsilon < |\zeta| < 1 + \epsilon$. The function $\frac{\alpha + k}{1 + h}$ is meromorphic in the strip: $1 - \epsilon < |\zeta| < 1$ and has a non-tangential limit a.e. on Γ . By (14) this non-tangential limit $= \varphi(\zeta) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \zeta} \tilde{\varphi}(z)$ a.e. on Γ . It follows that

$$\frac{\alpha + k}{1 + h} = \tilde{\varphi} \quad \text{in } 1 - \epsilon < |\zeta| < 1. \quad (15)$$

Thus $\frac{\alpha + k}{1 + h}$ is analytic in that strip and is meromorphic in $\{|\zeta| < 1\}$, and hence has at most a finite number of poles in $\text{int}\Delta$. We denote these poles by $z_1, \dots, z_n$. Let

$$Q(\zeta) = \prod_{j=1}^n (\zeta - z_j).$$

Then $Q \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha + k}{1 + h} \right)$ is analytic on $\text{int}\Delta$. Since $\frac{\alpha + k}{1 + h} = \tilde{\varphi}$ on the strip $1 - \epsilon < |\zeta| < 1$, $Q \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha + k}{1 + h} \right)$ is continuous up to Γ , and coincides with $Q \cdot \varphi$ on Γ .

Thus $Q \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha+k}{1+h}\right)$ lies in $\mathfrak{A}_0$ and hence in $\mathfrak{M}$. For $\zeta_0 \in \text{int}\Delta$, we have, by (4),

$$\left| Q \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha+k}{1+h}\right) (\zeta_0) - (Q\varphi)(\zeta_0) \right| \leq M_{\zeta_0} \cdot \sup_{\Gamma} \left| Q \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha+k}{1+h}\right) - (Q\varphi) \right| = 0.$$

So $Q \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha+k}{1+h}\right)$ and $(Q\varphi)$ agree at ζ_0 . This holds for each ζ_0 . Thus they coincide on Δ .

So $Q\varphi$ is analytic on $\text{int}\Delta$, and hence φ is meromorphic on $\text{int}\Delta$. But by hypothesis, φ is continuous on Δ . So φ is analytic on Δ and we are done. $\blacksquare$

Using this notion of projective hull, we next consider a generalization of Theorem 2 where the disk Δ is replaced by the *punctured disk* $\Delta - \{0\}$. Given a continuous function φ defined on $\Delta - \{0\}$, let γ denote its graph over Γ and let Σ denote its graph over $\Delta - \{0\}$. Thus

$$\gamma = \{(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta)) : \zeta \in \Gamma\} \subset \mathbf{C}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma = \{(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta)) : \zeta \in \Delta - \{0\}\} \subset \mathbf{C}^2.$$

What strengthening of hypothesis (4) will imply that φ is analytic on $\Delta - \{0\}$ and has either a pole or a removable singularity at $\zeta = 0$?

PROPOSITION 3. *If φ is analytic on $\Delta - \{0\}$ and has either a pole or a removable singularity at $\{\zeta = 0\}$, then Σ is contained in the projective hull $\widehat{\gamma}$ of γ .*

Proof. Fix $P \in \mathcal{P}_d$ with $\sup_{\gamma} |P| \leq 1$. Suppose φ has a pole at 0 of order k . Then $P(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta))$ is meromorphic on Δ with only a pole at $\zeta = 0$ of order $\leq dk$.

Fix $\zeta_0 \in \text{int}\Delta$. The function $\zeta^{dk} P(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta))$ is holomorphic on Δ . Hence,

$$\zeta_0^{dk} P(\zeta_0, \varphi(\zeta_0)) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{\zeta^{dk} P(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta))}{\zeta - \zeta_0} d\zeta$$

Therefore

$$|\zeta_0^{dk} P(\zeta_0, \varphi(\zeta_0))| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{1 - |\zeta_0|} \int_{\Gamma} |P(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta))| d\theta \leq \frac{1}{1 - |\zeta_0|}.$$

So

$$|P(\zeta_0, \varphi(\zeta_0))| \leq \frac{1}{1 - |\zeta_0|} \left(\frac{1}{|\zeta_0|^k} \right)^d.$$

This holds for all d , so $(\zeta_0, \varphi(\zeta_0)) \in \widehat{\gamma}$. $\blacksquare$

Note: This proposition also follows from results in [2].

QUESTION 4. *Is the converse of Proposition 3 true? That is, given φ continuous on the punctured disk and real analytic on the boundary, with φ and Σ as before, does the hypothesis: $\Sigma \subset \widehat{\gamma}$ imply that φ is holomorphic on $\text{int}\Delta - \{0\}$ and has at $\{\zeta = 0\}$ either a pole or a removable singularity?*

Written explicitly, our hypothesis states: If $\zeta_0 \in \Delta - \{0\}$, then there exists a constant C_{ζ_0} such that

$$|P(\zeta_0, \varphi(\zeta_0))| \leq (C_{\zeta_0})^d \cdot \sup_{\Gamma} |P(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta))| \quad \text{for } P \in \mathcal{P}_d$$

The following theorem gives a partial answer to Question 4. Recall that it is necessary that the function φ be real analytic when restricted to Γ (or at least that its graph be a pluripolar curve in $\mathbf{C}^2$). It is natural therefore to assume φ to be real analytic on punctured disk. We shall assume further that φ is real analytic on the entire plane.

THEOREM 5. *Let Φ be an entire function on $\mathbf{C}^2$ written as $\Phi(z, w) = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} a_{nm} z^n w^m$, the series converging on all of $\mathbf{C}^2$. Let*

$$\varphi(\zeta) \equiv \Phi(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} a_{nm} \zeta^n \bar{\zeta}^m, \quad \zeta \in \mathbf{C}. \quad (16)$$

Define $\gamma = \{(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta)) : \zeta \in \Gamma\}$ and $\Sigma = \{(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta)) : \zeta \in \Delta\}$.

Assume that $\Sigma \subset \hat{\gamma}$. Then φ is complex analytic on $\Delta - \{0\}$ with a removable singularity at $\zeta = 0$.

Proof. Suppose φ is not complex analytic on $\Delta - \{0\}$. Since the series representing φ converges for all $\zeta \in \mathbf{C}$, we have for each $R > 0$ a constant C_R such that $|a_{nm}| \leq C_R/R^{n+m}$ for all n, m . Fix d . We may write

$$\varphi(\zeta) = \sum_{n+m \leq d} a_{nm} \zeta^n \bar{\zeta}^m + \sum_{n+m > d} a_{nm} \zeta^n \bar{\zeta}^m \quad \zeta \in \mathbf{C}.$$

We denote the second term on the right hand side by $\epsilon_d(\zeta)$.

We have for each $|\zeta| \leq 2$, and for each $R > 2$, that

$$\begin{aligned} |\epsilon_d(\zeta)| &\leq \sum_{n+m > d} |a_{nm}| 2^{n+m} \\ &\leq \sum_{n+m > d} \frac{C_R}{R^{n+m}} 2^{n+m} = \sum_{k > d} \sum_{n+m=k} \frac{C_R}{R^k} 2^k = \sum_{k > d} \sum_{n+m=k} C_R(k+1) \left(\frac{2}{R}\right)^k \\ &\leq C_R \left[(d+1) \left(\frac{2}{R}\right)^d + (d+2) \left(\frac{2}{R}\right)^{d+1} + \dots \right] \\ &= C_R \left(\frac{2}{R}\right)^d \left[(d+1) + (d+2) \left(\frac{2}{R}\right) + (d+3) \left(\frac{2}{R}\right)^2 + \dots \right] \\ &\leq C_R \left(\frac{2}{R}\right)^d (4+2d) \quad \text{for } R > 4. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exist R_0, d_0 with

$$|\epsilon_d(\zeta)| \leq C_R \left(\frac{4}{R}\right)^d \quad \forall \zeta, |\zeta| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \forall R > R_0 \quad \text{and} \quad d > d_0. \quad (17)$$

Define now for all d the polynomial

$$P_d(\zeta, w) = \zeta^d w - \sum_{n+m \leq d} a_{nm} \zeta^n \zeta^{d-m}.$$

Then P_d lies in $\mathcal{P}_{2d}$.

For (ζ, w) in γ we have $w = \varphi(\zeta)$ and $\bar{\zeta} = \frac{1}{\zeta}$, so

$$P_d(\zeta, w) = \zeta^d \left[\sum_{n+m \leq d} a_{nm} \zeta^n \frac{1}{\zeta^m} + \epsilon_d(\zeta) \right] - \zeta^d \left[\sum_{n+m \leq d} a_{nm} \zeta^n \frac{1}{\zeta^m} \right] = \zeta^d \epsilon_d(\zeta)$$

for $\zeta \in \Gamma$. Hence,

$$|P_d(\zeta)| \leq |\epsilon_d(\zeta)| \leq C_R \left(\frac{4}{R} \right)^d \quad \text{on } \gamma \quad (18)$$

by (17).

Now by assumption φ is not complex analytic, so for some $m > 0$, $a_{nm} \neq 0$. The function $\alpha \mapsto \Phi(\alpha, \bar{\alpha}) - \Phi(\alpha, \frac{1}{\alpha})$ is real-analytic in $|\alpha| > 0$. Suppose $\Phi(\alpha, \bar{\alpha}) - \Phi(\alpha, \frac{1}{\alpha})$ is identically zero. Then $\alpha \mapsto \Phi(\alpha, \bar{\alpha})$ is complex-analytic on $|\alpha| > 0$, and so φ is complex-analytic, contrary to assumption.

Thus $\Phi(\alpha, \bar{\alpha}) - \Phi(\alpha, \frac{1}{\alpha})$ is not identically zero. We therefore can choose α_0 in $\frac{1}{2} < |\alpha| < 1$ such that $\Phi(\alpha_0, \bar{\alpha}_0) - \Phi(\alpha_0, \frac{1}{\alpha_0}) = \tau \neq 0$. We next estimate the value of P_d at the point $(\alpha_0, \varphi(\alpha_0))$ in Σ .

$$\begin{aligned} P_d(\alpha_0, \varphi(\alpha_0)) &= \alpha_0^d \left[\sum_{n+m \leq d} a_{nm} \alpha_0^n \bar{\alpha}_0^m + \epsilon_d(\alpha_0) \right] - \alpha_0^d \left[\sum_{n+m \leq d} a_{nm} \alpha_0^n \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_0} \right)^m \right] \\ &= \alpha_0^d \left[\sum_{n+m \leq d} a_{nm} \alpha_0^n \bar{\alpha}_0^m - \sum_{n+m \leq d} a_{nm} \alpha_0^n \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_0} \right)^m \right] + \alpha_0^d \epsilon_d(\alpha_0) \end{aligned}$$

For large d , then, we have in view of (17) that

$$\begin{aligned} |P_d(\alpha_0, \varphi(\alpha_0))| &\geq |\alpha_0|^d \left| \Phi(\alpha_0, \bar{\alpha}_0) - \Phi(\alpha_0, \frac{1}{\alpha_0}) \right| \cdot \frac{1}{2} - |\alpha_0|^d |\epsilon_d(\alpha_0)| \\ &= |\alpha_0|^d \left[\frac{|\tau|}{2} - |\epsilon_d(\alpha_0)| \right] \geq |\alpha_0|^d \frac{|\tau|}{4} \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$|P_d(\alpha_0, \varphi(\alpha_0))| \geq |\alpha_0|^d \frac{|\tau|}{4} \quad \text{for large } d. \quad (19)$$

Also, for each $R > 4$, we have by (18) that $|P_d| \leq C_R (\frac{4}{R})^d$ on γ , so

$$\left| \frac{P_d}{C_R (\frac{4}{R})^d} \right| \leq 1 \quad \text{on } \gamma.$$

By our hypothesis, $(\alpha_0, \varphi(\alpha_0)) \in \widehat{\gamma}$, so by definition of $\widehat{\gamma}$ there exists a constant C_{α_0} such that

$$\left| \frac{P_d(\alpha_0, \varphi(\alpha_0))}{C_R \left(\frac{4}{R}\right)^d} \right| \leq (C_{\alpha_0})^{2d} \quad \text{for all } d \geq d_0.$$

So

$$|P_d(\alpha_0, \varphi(\alpha_0))| \leq C_R \left(\frac{4}{R} \cdot C_{\alpha_0}^2 \right)^d \quad \text{for all } d \geq d_0. \quad (20)$$

We now choose R so that $\frac{4}{R} \cdot C_{\alpha_0} < |\alpha_0|$, and let $d \rightarrow \infty$. Then (20) and (19) yield a contradiction. So φ is complex-analytic on $\Delta - \{0\}$ and hence on all of Δ . ■

NOTE.6 Since φ is real analytic on the entire ζ -plane, it follows that φ is an entire holomorphic function of ζ .

Theorem 9.2 of [2] yields that if f is an entire holomorphic function on $\mathbf{C}$, then for a closed curve K on the graph Σ_f of f , the projective hull $\widehat{K}$ of K in $\mathbf{C}^2$ equals K union the bounded components of $\Sigma_f - K$. Together with Theorem 5 just given we get :

COROLLARY 7. *Let φ be given by a series $\sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} a_{nm} \zeta^n \bar{\zeta}^m$ which converges for all $\zeta \in \mathbf{C}$. Let $\gamma = \{(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta)) : \zeta \in \Gamma\}$. Then φ is an entire holomorphic function of ζ if and only if $\{(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta)) : \zeta \in \Delta\} = \widehat{\gamma}$.*

References

- [1] W. Rudin, "Real and Complex Analysis", McGraw Hill, Inc., N.Y., 1966.
- [2] F. R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson, Jr., *Projective hulls and the projective Gelfand transformation*, Asian J. Math. **10**, no. 3 (2006), 279-319.

Brown University
Providence, R.I.